

Criticism of Schaffner

S. Sklar
of Salmon
(object to Truth
value constant in P or Jettys)
Is it 59, 442-8.
no explicit
in P or Jettys)

- 1.) $P(e/a)$ is probability of e on chances other than
- 2.) In footnote expands $P(e/a)$ in terms of alternative competing chances.
- 3.) Theory supporting factor has low value of $P(e/a)$
high value of $P(e/T \& Z)$

$$\text{now } P(e/T \& Z) = 1$$

$$P(e/a) = x + \epsilon(1-x) = x(1-\epsilon) + \epsilon.$$

~~theory~~ ^{now} supporting fact has a low of ϵ
It does not mean necessarily $P(e/a)$ is
small as x may be large.

$$\begin{array}{l} x + \epsilon \\ x \leq 1 \\ x + \epsilon(1-x) \leq 1 \end{array}$$

It is ad hoc 2.

- 4.) Schaffner now switches to ad hoc 3.
ad hoc. H' is ad hoc if $P(H'/a)$ is
small and $\leq P(e/a)$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{if } x \leq x + \epsilon(1-x) \\ \text{or } \epsilon(1-x) \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

we have $\lambda = \frac{1}{x + \epsilon(1-x)}$ For $x \leq \epsilon \leq 1$
 $\lambda \rightarrow \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ as λ is large

theory is not ad hoc unless $\lambda = 1$

Indeed s. take

$$\frac{P(T'/e \& u)}{P(T'/u)} = \frac{P(e/T' \& u)}{P(e/u)} = \frac{1}{P(e/u)}$$

$\gg 1$ if $P(e/u)$ is small.

So e may confirm T' unless $\varepsilon = 1$.

5.) Fodor's asym. condition for ad hoc is

$$P(e/u) \gg P(H'/u) \gg \frac{P(H'/u)P(o/u)}{P(T'/u)}$$

$$\text{or } x(1-\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \gg x$$

$$\text{or } \varepsilon(1-x) \gg 0$$

This condition is not satisfied
by $x \leq 1$ unless $\varepsilon \gg 0$

Correct condition is $\Omega = 1$

$$\text{or } x + \varepsilon(1-x) = 1$$

$$\text{or } (1-x)(1-\varepsilon) = 0$$

$$\text{or } \underline{\varepsilon = 1}$$

6.) S. states \mathbb{U} $p(H'/\mathbb{U})$ is small.
 e cannot confirm T' .
 This is false if $\varepsilon \leq 1$.

7.) e is excluded from \mathbb{U} — not denied
 but this is not reason for \mathbb{U} to be correct.

8.) Effect of new e' on T rule, include
 e in a new background \mathbb{U}' .

$$p(H'/\mathbb{U}') > p(H'/\mathbb{U}) \quad \text{since } p(e/\mathbb{U}) \text{ is small.}$$

(only true if ε is small)

$$= p(H'/\mathbb{U} \wedge e)$$

9.) consider ratio $\frac{p(e'/\mathbb{U}'/T')}{p(e'/T_i/\mathbb{U}')} \text{ always} = 1$

free of dependency protection ratios.
~~just~~ and $e \rightarrow e'$ then ratios may be larger.
 if T' explains e' as against \mathbb{U} does not explain
 of \mathbb{U} fort.